



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER

FILING DATE

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO

01/08/99 01/08/99 01/08/99

EXAMINER

MM21/0301
SUPERIOR UNION ZINN MACPEAK & SEARS
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON DC 20007

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

6

DATE MAILED: 03/01/99

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☐ This application has been examined. ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire _____ month(s), 30 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. ☐ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. ☐ Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
3. ☐ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. ☐ Notice of informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152.
5. ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6. ☐

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☐ Claim(s) 1-42 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s) _____ is withdrawn from consideration.
2. Claim(s) _____ has been canceled.
3. Claim(s) _____ is allowed.
4. Claim(s) _____ is rejected.
5. Claim(s) _____ is objected to.
6. ☐ Claim(s) 1-42 are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawing(s) under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawing(s) are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable. ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____ has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. The proposed drawing correction(s), filed on _____, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 USC 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit: 2878

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: I) The embodiment illustrated in Figure 8B directed to an image sensor device comprising a thin film light source with more than one light emission portion having an area smaller than that of the light receiving elements. II) The embodiment illustrated in Figure 9B directed to an image sensor device comprising a thin film light source with a light emission portion having an area larger than the light receiving elements. III) The embodiment illustrated in Figure 10 directed to an image sensor device comprising a thin film source; and a light absorption unit disposed between the source and the document. IV) The embodiment illustrated in Figure 11 directed to an image sensor device comprising a thin film light source having a light emission portion interposed between a reflection mirror and a dielectric mirror. V) The embodiment illustrated in Figure 12 directed to an image sensor device comprising a thin film light source having a particular type of optical fiber collection member wherein transmitting light is separated from reflecting light. VI) The embodiment illustrated in Figure 13 directed to an image sensor device comprising a thin film light source having an optical fiber collection member disposed between the light source and the document wherein transmitting light and reflecting light are on same path. VII) The embodiment illustrated in Figure 14 directed to an image sensor device comprising a thin film light source having an optical fiber collection member and an optical means (diffraction grating) for bending a course of light toward a predetermined direction. VIII) The embodiment illustrated in Figure 15 directed to an image sensor device comprising a thin film light source having a light reflection layer as light guiding means and image sensitivity adjusting means. IX) The embodiment illustrated in Figure 16 directed to an image

Art Unit: 2878

sensor device comprising a thin film light source having a light emission layer uniformly formed on the entire surface of the resultant structure. X) The embodiment illustrated in Figure 17 directed to an image sensor device comprising a blue light emission layer and color changing layers.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. M.E.P.. § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 2878

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Le at telephone number (703) 308-4830.

Le2/26

Que T. Le
Primary Examiner